

REMARKS

Applicants gratefully acknowledge rejoinder of claims 1-13 and 24-26.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as not showing the shaving cartridge permanently attached to the cartridge. In order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have cancelled claim 25, which is the only claim reciting this feature, without prejudice.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. The antecedence error noted by the Examiner has been corrected. Other amendments have been made to these claims for antecedence and clarity.

Applicants have also amended claims 7 and 18 to clarify that the normal pivot angle for a particular shaving cartridge has a predetermined value which represents an endpoint, rather than the normal pivot angle falling somewhere within a range.

Claims 1-6, 24 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Apprille. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 1 and 24 recite that the connecting member has a load-bearing surface arranged and configured to contact the housing only when the housing is pivoted beyond a limit angle that is greater than the normal pivot angle. As discussed in Applicants' previous responses, Apprille does not disclose or suggest load-bearing surfaces that are contacted only when the housing is pivoted beyond a limit angle that is greater than the normal pivot angle. Thus, Apprille cannot anticipate claim 1 or claim 24.

Claims 1, 24 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Coffin. Claims 1 and 24 recite that the connecting member has a load-bearing surface arranged and configured to contact the housing only when the housing is pivoted beyond a limit angle that is greater than the normal pivot angle. As discussed in Applicants' previous response, Coffin does not disclose or suggest load-bearing surfaces that are contacted only when the housing is pivoted beyond a limit angle that is greater than the normal pivot angle. Thus, Coffin cannot anticipate claim 1 or claim 24.

Claims 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coffin. These claims are patentable for at least the reason that they depend from a patentable base claim.

Claims 12-14, 22, 23 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Apprille in view of Rosenkranc, and claims 20, 21 and 25 have been unpatentable over Apprille. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claims 1 and 24 as anticipated by Apprille.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reason for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to amendment.

It is believed that no fees are due with this submission. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 00216-667001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 3, 2007

/Celia H. Leber/
Celia H. Leber
Reg. No. 33,524

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906